



ENSURING AMERICA'S STRENGTH AND SECURITY:

A Democratic National Security Strategy for the 21st Century

September 2005

Prepared by the Office of the Democratic Whip

Ensuring America's Strength and Security:
A Democratic National Security
Strategy for the 21st Century

Our highest duty is to protect the American people, secure our homeland, strengthen our national security, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

Democrats are proud of our strong tradition of leadership in world affairs, from Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, to Harry Truman and John Kennedy, to Lyndon Johnson and Bill Clinton. These Democratic leaders demonstrated that defending America requires our nation to marshal the full range of its power – economic and moral, diplomatic and military – to fight for human freedom, foster democracy and defeat tyranny and terrorism. And Jimmy Carter made clear to the world our nation's commitment to human rights.

We are clear-eyed about what it takes to sustain and strengthen our national security. America must be willing to use military force to defend vital interests and protect the American people. Peace at all costs is no peace at all. But victory in an era of terror will not be achieved by military power alone. We must pursue an integrated strategy that employs our military power, intelligence, homeland defense, diplomacy, economic leverage, and the enduring power of our ideals.

We are committed to a robust national security strategy that uses all the powers at our disposal to make our nation safer and our posture in the world stronger. The objectives of this Democratic national security strategy are threefold:

- Defend the Homeland
- Defeat Terrorism
- Promote Democracy, Freedom and Human Rights

The following proposals serve these ends, and we intend to make them part of the national security discussion today.

STRENGTHENING AND MAINTAINING AMERICA'S MILITARY FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE THREATS

THE ISSUE: America has the finest military in the world. But since 9/11, our nation's armed forces have become over-extended and now face a crisis in recruiting and retention. How do we ensure that the United States military remains second to none?

OUR POSITION: The American military must be sufficient to protect our nation and our interests abroad, and prepared to meet existing and emerging threats. We are committed to an all-volunteer military, and believe that we have a fundamental responsibility to ensure that the U.S. military remains the best in the world. We strongly support providing our military men and women with the training, equipment and quality of life that they need and deserve. It is unconscionable that many of our men and women in harm's way in Iraq and Afghanistan have died or been injured as a direct result of being improperly equipped. Additionally, we will continue to insist that the development of future weapons systems not deprive our troops of the training and equipment that they need. And, we will continue to stand by our troops and their families, pressing for equitable pay, quality health care, improved housing, and better veterans' services and benefits.

OUR PROPOSAL: First and foremost, we support an increase in end-strength of 100,000 troops, along with enhancements to recruiting and retention that help relieve the burden on the National Guard and Reserves. Second, we support investing in weapons systems that bear a relationship to the gravity and nature of the threats we face. And third, we support completing the military's modernization effort.

DEFEATING GLOBAL TERRORISM

THE ISSUE: Since 9/11, the United States has dealt heavy blows to al Qaeda and international terrorist networks. However, in October 2003, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld acknowledged that “we lack metrics to know if we are winning or losing the war on terror,” and that we are “putting relatively little effort into a long-range plan” to prevail. How can we defeat global terrorism?

OUR POSITION: We must use every tool at our disposal – including military force – to capture, kill or disrupt international terrorists who are intent on attacking our homeland and our citizens, as well as our interests in other parts of the world. The lesson of 9/11 is clear: There are terrorists in the world who want to destroy us and they have no compunction about killing innocent men, women and children to further their aims. We must take the fight to the enemy and redouble our efforts to capture Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants. At the same time, we must engage allies in a global network in which each country embraces the defeat of terrorism as a common cause. We ourselves must recognize that this is not only a war of arms, but also a war of ideas. The United States needs a long-term strategy to dispel the anti-Americanism that exists in some parts of the world, and which is particularly virulent in many Islamic nations. And, we must continue to support the expansion of freedom, the advance of democracy and the promotion of free markets around the globe.

OUR PROPOSAL: First, we must capture or kill terrorists who are bent on attacking Americans and other innocent people. Second, we should target the broader network of global terror groups. This requires penetrating their networks; seizing their assets and stopping them from raising money; and pressuring governments to deny them safe haven. Third, over the long term, we must get to the roots of such fanaticism, promote democratic reform and economic opportunity in Islamic nations, convince governments to clamp down on institutions that serve as breeding grounds for terrorists, and encourage reformers.

PREVENTING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND A WMD CATASTROPHE

THE ISSUE: The terrorists who struck on 9/11 may have lacked nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons, but they did not lack the malevolence to use them. In February 2004, the Director of Central Intelligence told Congress that Osama bin Laden considered the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction to be a “religious obligation.” The DCI warned that al Qaeda “continues to pursue its strategic goal of obtaining a nuclear capability.” In fact, in 2003, bin Laden obtained a fatwa – or religious ruling – from a radical Saudi cleric authorizing the use of a nuclear weapon against U.S. civilians as permissible under Islamic law. How do we prevent the unthinkable from occurring?

OUR POSITION: We will do what it takes to prevent weapons of mass destruction from being used to attack the American people. The damage done by a nuclear, chemical or biological attack on the United States would be devastating. As Graham Allison writes in Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe, the categorical imperative is to do everything we can to avoid such a catastrophe, on the fastest possible timetable. *“This is not a case where it’s possible to do too much,” he states.* But we can do too little, and the Bush Administration has done just that. It has requested less funding for non-proliferation in 2006 than we budgeted in 2001. Republicans in Congress have gone so far as to vote against Democratic initiatives to increase funding for vital non-proliferation efforts. In the meantime, North Korea claims to have developed six to eight nuclear weapons; Iran is well on its way to making fissile materials; and research reactors around the world house nuclear materials, in many cases secured by no more than a chain-link fence.

OUR PROPOSAL: The United States must develop a strategy to ensure that terrorists and rogue states do not acquire biological, chemical or nuclear weapons. As part of that strategy, we support:

- Securing and accounting for all of the world’s nuclear materials as soon as possible.
- Tripling the funding for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (Nunn-Lugar) and other non-proliferation programs.
- Working with the Russians to establish a baseline inventory of all nuclear materials, including nuclear materials in tactical and sub-strategic weapons.
- Agreeing with the Russians to remove a significant number of our nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert.
- Targeting rogue states that traffic in weapons of mass destruction.

- Marshaling the world against weapons of mass destruction and acting with other states to strengthen the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.
- Ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

ACHIEVING SUCCESS IN IRAQ

THE ISSUE: After deposing Saddam Hussein and destroying his regime, the United States remains engaged in a vicious battle against insurgents who oppose the establishment of democracy in Iraq and are determined to drive our forces out before that goal is accomplished. How can we defeat the insurgency and help Iraqis establish a free, stable, democratic Iraq?

OUR POSITION: We must succeed in Iraq, and will do what it takes to achieve our goals there. We must succeed for the sake of our own national security, the stability of Iraq and the Middle East region, and our global standing and credibility. A free, democratic Iraq will enhance the security of the United States and the world. Our mission in Iraq has been plagued from the start by poor intelligence, insufficient preparation for the onset of military action, poor planning for the post-war, and a disdain for the advice of our allies and our own military leaders. The Army's chief of staff was ignored, and too few troops were deployed. In fact, the Bush Administration's refusal to deploy enough troops from the outset was a monumental error that continues to haunt us today. The situation on the ground for American servicemen and women is perilous. And, this failure to secure Iraq has left us unable to provide basic services (electricity, water, sanitation) to the Iraqi people. Even oil production is below pre-war levels. In addition, the Administration failed to foresee the insurgency that followed the war, and many of our servicemen and women who were deployed were not properly equipped with body armor or armored vehicles. Troops were forced to improvise in the field and assigned to duty for which they were not trained. These and other errors in judgment have cost us casualties and made the insurgency more intractable.

OUR PROPOSAL: First, we must supply our troops in Iraq with everything they need to suppress the insurgency and secure the country – including, if necessary, additional troops. And, if the Administration refuses to do that, we believe that we must develop alternative strategies that ensure the protection of our troops, rather than continuing to leave them vulnerable. However, we do not believe that strict timetables for withdrawing American troops from Iraq are strategically appropriate, but instead support the setting of concrete benchmarks for success. Second, we must step up the training of Iraqi security forces – army, border guards, building guards, police and special counter-terrorism units – so that we can turn over to Iraqis the responsibility for securing their own country. If the Iraqis cannot or will not fight to secure their country, we will not succeed and should not stay in Iraq. Third, we should help the Iraqi forces protect themselves through the provision of better armor and smarter security where recruits gather. Fourth, we

must assist Iraqis in forming a functioning representative government, in which all ethnic groups have a voice. And fifth, we must enlist greater allied assistance in protecting Iraq's borders and preventing the infiltration of foreign terrorists.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

AT HOME

THE ISSUE: Despite the expenditure of billions of dollars on homeland security since 9/11, the American people are still vulnerable to attack by terrorists at home. Specifically, our ports, chemical facilities, transportation systems and critical infrastructure have not been adequately secured. How can we best secure our homeland?

OUR POSITION: We will do what is necessary to protect the American people and our homeland from another attack. Along with our allies, we must act against terrorists wherever they are, while also addressing the homeland security vulnerabilities that persist. We have opposed the funding cuts proposed by the Administration for law enforcement, firefighters and homeland security grant programs. Furthermore, we believe that serious questions about the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department of Homeland Security must be addressed immediately. Certain bureaus and agencies within DHS are under-staffed and expend too much time and energy on organizational issues that should be devoted to protecting the United States from attack.

OUR PROPOSAL: We believe that our homeland is vulnerable to terrorist attack and that these vulnerabilities can be addressed most effectively by:

- Adopting a risk-based formula for disbursing homeland security funding.
- Enacting a comprehensive border protection plan that prevents terrorists from entering our country.
- Meeting our commitments under the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, including providing funds to hire additional border patrol agents, to secure all air cargo, to install radiation monitors at all ports of entry, and to install explosive detection systems at major airports.
- Assessing the risks to nuclear power plants, chemical plants, the energy grid and other critical infrastructure, and enhancing security at such facilities.
- Increasing security for mass transit through additional funding for rail, bus and subway security.

STRENGTHENING OUR INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES EVEN FURTHER

THE ISSUE: America has suffered two massive intelligence failures in four years. Last year's landmark reform of the intelligence community was a critical step to fix those problems, but much more needs to be done to obtain accurate intelligence to stop catastrophic terrorist attacks and prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction. How can we further improve our intelligence capabilities to protect our nation and its people?

OUR POSITION: The brave men and women of the intelligence community deserve the best tools to accomplish their mission. The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which established the position of Director of National Intelligence (DNI), will provide them those tools by integrating the entire intelligence community under a single "commander." The new DNI must oversee a significant increase in human intelligence capabilities, which will enable us to access denied areas and penetrate hard targets. The DNI must also greatly improve analysis, to avoid the type of "group-think" that resulted in the flawed intelligence over Iraq's WMD programs.

OUR PROPOSAL: First, the President must support the DNI and prevent others in Congress or in his own Administration from eroding the DNI's budget or personnel power. Second, the DNI should recruit, train, and clear intelligence officers and analysts with the language skills and cultural background to penetrate hard targets, including Islamist terrorists groups, Iran, and North Korea. This will require establishing a multi-tier security clearance system, so that patriotic Americans with family abroad can obtain clearances to work in the intelligence community. Third, the intelligence community should scrub the estimates of the WMD programs in Iran and North Korea, so that U.S. policy is not based on poor intelligence. And fourth, the Administration must end the practice of paying for counterterrorism intelligence with supplemental "emergency" budgets, which prevents our intelligence officers from planning future operations.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S PUBLIC DIPLOMACY AND ALLIANCES

THE ISSUE: Anti-Americanism exists in many parts of the world and is particularly virulent in many Islamic nations. In recent years, too many of our allies have become alienated by American policy. How can we best improve America's image throughout the world and promote democratic values, as well as strengthen our alliances?

OUR POSITION: We believe it is imperative that the United States immediately begin to rebuild its alliances and friendships around the world – not because multilateralism is an end in itself, but because it is a means to strengthen our national security. We are, however, prepared to act unilaterally if the national security of the United States demands it.

The most important national security issues facing the United States today – including winning the war on terrorism and stopping the spread of weapons of mass destruction – require not only military capability and will, but also strong public diplomacy and alliances.

The United States must continue to pursue international peace and development initiatives throughout the world – including the Middle East peace process and the fight against the global AIDS pandemic – because our interests require a global commitment. We stand ready to work with allies and international institutions to find solutions to these challenges.

OUR PROPOSAL: Democrats will work with our allies to confront the challenges of our times: terrorism, poverty and malnutrition, the AIDS pandemic and global climate change. We believe that a willingness to do so is a sign of strength and wisdom, not weakness and irresolution. We also are committed to working to refocus NATO to meet the challenges of the 21st century, including the war on terror and ensuring stability in the Middle East.

BOLSTERING POST-CONFLICT RECONSTRUCTION CAPABILITIES

THE ISSUE: Our efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan have demonstrated that a civilian counterpart to America's military power is vital but sorely lacking. How can we best prepare for future post-conflict reconstruction efforts?

OUR POSITION: George W. Bush took office in 2001 after deriding the concept of "nation building." We believe that post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization are an essential part of the effort to protect our nation and our interests abroad. Furthermore, the importance of stabilizing weak and failing states and preventing them from becoming rogue nations or terrorist havens is increasingly clear. Thus, we must make a commitment to a comprehensive, integrated program of reconstruction and stabilization that will help avoid the creation of failed states that threaten our security.

OUR PROPOSAL: We support the establishment of a commission within the United Nations to coordinate and undertake the work of nation building once an armed conflict has ended and the initial phase of peacekeeping is over. The post-conflict work of preparing for elections, reconstruction, rebuilding civil society and restoring infrastructure fall beyond the scope of traditional peacekeeping forces or U.S. military personnel. It is vital that the work of nation building be undertaken by the international community, rather than by the United States alone, so that the costs and challenges can be shared among allies and so that newly created states will gain greater legitimacy as a result of multilateral efforts and support.

LEADING THE FIGHT FOR UNITED NATIONS REFORM

THE ISSUE: The United Nations is failing to live up to its mandate, and is badly in need of reform. How can we reform the U.N.?

OUR POSITION: The United States' national security interests are served and strengthened by participation in international organizations such as the United Nations. The U.N. can play an important role in the effort to achieve political and economic stability and to promote respect for human rights. Too often, however, the U.N. has failed to live up to its mandate. Its ineffectiveness and inaction in the face of ethnic cleansing and genocide in Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda and Sudan are the most recent examples. Furthermore, the U.N. has shown that it does not have the will to act against rogue states and dictators who flout international law. And, it has damaged its own credibility by taking absurd actions, such as allowing Libya to head the U.N. Human Rights Commission. We believe it is important that the United States lead an effort to reform the U.N. in a manner that will enable the organization to respond effectively to international problems and crises.

OUR PROPOSAL: First, we believe the U.N. must implement financial oversight and accountability reforms to address the repeated incidents of scandal and corruption that have diminished the credibility and effectiveness of that organization. Second, it must take steps to end the disgraceful conduct of some of its peacekeepers, and hold accountable those individuals found to be violating the trust of the civilians that they have been sent to protect. Third, the United States should urge the U.N. to impose sanctions, suspend the U.N. membership and deploy peacekeepers to stop the perpetrators of genocide, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. Democrats will ensure these reforms are implemented, namely by providing the Secretary of State with discretion to withhold or redirect a portion of the United States' contributions to the U.N. Fourth, the existing Human Rights Commission, whose current membership discredits its existence, should be replaced by a Human Rights Council. The new Council would require its members to meet human rights standards and no member could currently be under sanctions for human rights violations. Fifth, we should empower the Community of Democracies by establishing a permanent secretariat for a formal U.N. Democracy Caucus, which would be a counterweight to U.N. caucuses that have blocked resolutions in favor of democracy and human rights.

DEVELOPING A STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

THE ISSUE: The United States' dependence on foreign petroleum poses a serious risk to our national security and our economic well-being. How can we best promote energy independence?

OUR POSITION: We believe the United States must immediately develop a proactive energy strategy that includes the promotion of energy efficiency and the investment in alternative and new energy technologies. We cannot ensure the security of our nation if we do not achieve energy independence during the next decade.

OUR PROPOSAL: We must make a concerted effort to improve the diversity and reliability of the nation's energy resources, both in terms of electricity and transportation fuels. First, for the long term, we will undertake a "New Manhattan Project" to accelerate major breakthroughs in hydrogen fuel, composite materials and nanotechnology to make automobiles – which create the greatest demand for petroleum products – lighter, stronger and far more fuel efficient. Second, we must make greater investments in renewable energy, alternative fuels such as biomass, and efficiency improvements to answer our growing demand for energy. Third, we must undertake a complete review of regulations that may inhibit distributed electric generation, as well as gasoline refining and other supply bottlenecks that create regional emergencies that threaten the well-being of our economy and the health and safety of our citizens. And fourth, we must make every effort to use all of our energy sources, making each a cleaner, safer contributor to the nation's energy resources.

THE THREAT OF FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY TO OUR NATION'S SECURITY

THE ISSUE: In four years, the Bush Administration and Republican Congress have turned a projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion into a projected 10-year deficit of more than \$4 trillion. The federal government is running annual record deficits of nearly \$500 billion, with no real plan to rein in such deficits, and the national debt is approaching \$8 trillion and rising. This fiscal recklessness threatens our future economic growth and stability, as well as our national security. Indeed, failure to restore fiscally responsible policies will adversely affect our ability to address every other problem this nation faces. How can we best restore our nation's fiscal health and strength?

OUR POSITION: Fiscal responsibility is a foundation for our national security. Without adequate resources, we cannot respond to the challenges that will inevitably arise in the years to come. We believe the federal government must immediately arrest our exploding budget deficits and national debt by making hard choices on both taxes and spending. The profligate spending and reckless policies enacted by the Bush Administration and the Republican Congress endanger our economic growth and stability. Moreover, this fiscal irresponsibility has forced us to borrow nearly \$1 trillion over the last four years from foreign creditors, including China, Germany, Japan, and Saudi Arabia.

OUR PROPOSAL: We must reinstate budget enforcement rules, including pay-as-you-go budget rules that govern spending *and* revenue. These budget rules helped lead us out of our previous fiscal crisis. Furthermore, we must take steps to reduce our national debt. We must limit our spending increases to the priority investments that can be made within a path to balance.